

ok

who is the doctor on the team?

Reply Separator

Subject: Re: Re[2]: Merck-Medco
Author: Paul Goldenheim/PHARMA at NotesPO
Date: 1/16/97 9:22 PM

We have a lot going on in this area, but we are swamped. I don't think we need a separate team, but I am certainly willing to discuss. For the bup patch this is being done prospectively. For Oxy we are doing this both prospectively and retrospectively. A lot is underway. However, I am beginning to wonder if we should add a second MD to the OxyContin effort. The program is getting too large with pharmacoeconomics, post-op (in label and for changing the label), and the massive noncancer pain program. We have a tiger by the tail, and I wonder if we should add more muscle. Let's discuss over live sushi!

Michael Friedman at NORWALK @ CCMail
01/15/97 07:35 PM

To: Paul Goldenheim/PHARMA
cc:
Subject: Re[2]: Merck-Medco

New Forward Item:

----- Forwarded with Changes -----
From: Michael Friedman
Date: 1/15/97 3:09AM
*To: Dr Richard Sackler at NORWALK
Subject: Re[2]: Merck-Medco

New Text Item: Re: Merck-Medco

Sorry, this was intended for you as well as Richard.

MF

Forward Header

Subject: Re[2]: Merck-Medco
Author: Michael Friedman at NORWALK
Date: 1/15/97 3:09 AM

We can deal with addiction separately, however, we cannot avoid the main point here. We will need pharmacoeconomic studies to stay in business.

If we do not do them, I can promise you that we will eventually be shut out

2

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

PDD9520801623

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY, EX REL. JACK CONWAY, ATTORNEY GENERAL v. PURDUE
PHARMA L.P., ET AL., CIVIL ACTION NO. 07-CI-01303 (PIKE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT).

by the HMOs.

This is a serious matter that we cannot ignore and that we must discuss. We need these studies for Oxy and ALL FUTURE PRODUCTS. We cannot go on ignoring the reality of managed care and their economic proof requirements. I urge you and Paul to put in place an adequate rather than token budget and effort to get this stuff underway asap.

I, who am usually averse to teams, would suggest that we even consider a special pharmaco economic studies team. This is not an option. If we are to stay in business we need this proof of economic performance.

MF

Reply Separator

Subject: Re: Merck-Medco
Author: Dr Richard Sackler at NORWALK
Date: 1/14/97 10:20 PM

Why don't you guys plan a presentation about addiction that could be given first by RR or BK and eventually by our senior managed health care people.

I think that Paul has a good point, but we should consider that "addiction" may be a convenient way to "just say NO" and when this objection is obliterated, they will fall back on the question of cost.

Unless we can give a convincing presentation that c.r. products are less prone to addiction potential, abuse or diversion than i.r. products. I think that this can be done, but I defer to BK and RR and other experts.

Forward Header

Subject: Re: Merck-Medco
Author: Paul Goldenheim/PHARMA at NotesPO
Date: 1/14/97 2:42 PM

I am in agreement (I believe that we all are) that this area is very important, and we have a number of plans underway -- new trials, completed trials, and retrospective examinations of older data. However, the EMail that started this, I think, has little to do with pharmacoeconomics. We need to talk to Medco and others about addiction. In this regard, we have a strong PI and can bring a lot of experience and information to the table.

(Embedded
image moved Dr Richard Sackler at NORWALK @ CCMail
to file: 01/11/97 08:27 PM
PIC001.PCX)

To: Paul Goldenheim/PHARMA, Michael Friedman at NORWALK @ CCMail
cc: Robert Rader/PHARMA, Susan Rosen/PHARMA, Ron Fitzmartin/PHARMA,
William Mallin/PHARMA, Dr Robert Kaiko at NORWALK @ CCMail, Ellen
Ingber at NORWALK2 @ CCMail
Subject: Re: Merck-Medco

3

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

PDD9520801624

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY, EX REL. JACK CONWAY, ATTORNEY GENERAL v. PURDUE
PHARMA L.P., ET AL., CIVIL ACTION NO. 07-CI-01303 (PIKE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT).